



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,602	01/31/2002	Cristian Libanati	W9490-02	3426

7590

03/19/2003

Charles A. Cross  
W. R. Grace & Co.-Conn.  
Patent Dept.  
7500 Grace Drive  
Columbia, MD 21044-4098

EXAMINER

ROSE, SHEP K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1614

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
10/062602Applicant(s)  
LIBANATIExaminer  
S100P ROSEGroup Art Unit  
1614

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1 & 17 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1 & 17 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1616

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 13 to 17, drawn to a process for making an abrasive silica, classified in class 423, subclass 339.
- II. Claims 1 to 5, drawn to a silica abrasive composition, classified in class 51, subclass 308.
- III. Claims 6 to 12, drawn to a dentifrice with a silica abrasive, classified in class 424, subclass 49.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as abrasive for non-dentifrice scouring powders cleansers cleaning and polishing dentures, and other inanimate surfaces and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process can be used to make silica abrasive for non-dentifrice other products, such as scouring powder cleansers, for cleaning and polishing dentures, and other in animate surfaces. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group III is not required for Group I, a II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shep Rose whose telephone number is (703) 308-4609.

Art Unit: 1616

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday from 7:30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel can be reached on (703) 308-4725. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-3592 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.



**SHEP K. ROSE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Rose/LR  
March 17, 2003

PALM INTRANET

Day : Monday  
Date: 3/17/2003  
Time: 17:12:25

## Inventor Information for 10/062602

Inventor Name	City	State/Country
LIBANATI, CRISTIAN	SILVER SPRING	MARYLAND
MILLER, JAMES GEORGE	ELLICOTT CITY	MARYLAND
KEMPSKE, SANDRA JOAN	TOWSON	MARYLAND

Appln Info	Contents	Petition Info	Atty/Agent Info	Continuity Data	Foreign Data
------------	----------	---------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------

Search Another: Application# or Patent# PCT /  / or PG PUBS # Attorney Docket # Bar Code # 

To go back use Back button on your browser toolbar.

Back to [PALM](#) | [ASSIGNMENT](#) | [OASIS](#) | [Home page](#)

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 13 to 17, drawn to a process for making an abrasive silica, classified in class 423, subclass 339.
- II. Claims 1 to 5, drawn to a silica abrasive composition, classified in class 51, subclass 308.
- III. Claims 6 to 12, drawn to a dentifrice with a silica abrasive, classified in class 424, subclass 49.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as abrasive for non-dentifrice scouring powders cleansers cleaning and polishing dentures, and other inanimate surfaces and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process can be used to make silica abrasive for non-dentifrice other products, such as scouring powder cleansers, for cleaning and polishing dentures, and other in animate surfaces. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group III is not required for Group I, a II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shep Rose whose telephone number is (703) 308-4609.



Art Unit: 1616

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday from 7:30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel can be reached on (703) 308-4725. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-3592 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

*Shep Rose*  
SHEP K. ROSE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
SHEP K. ROSE

Rose/LR  
March 17, 2003

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 13 to 17, drawn to a process for making an abrasive silica, classified in class 423, subclass 339.
- II. Claims 1 to 5, drawn to a silica abrasive composition, classified in class 51, subclass 308.
- III. Claims 6 to 12, drawn to a dentifrice with a silica abrasive, classified in class 424, subclass 49.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as abrasive for non-dentifrice scouring powders cleansers cleaning and polishing dentures, and other inanimate surfaces and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process can be used to make silica abrasive for non-dentifrice other products, such as scouring powder cleansers, for cleaning and polishing dentures, and other in animate surfaces. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group III is not required for Group I, a II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shep Rose whose telephone number is (703) 308-4609.

Art Unit: 1616

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday from 7:30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel can be reached on (703) 308-4725. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-3592 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

*Shep K. Rose*  
SHEP K. ROSE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Rose/LR  
March 17, 2003